

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-26 remain pending, claims 1 and 14 being independent. In this reply, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 14.

Interview

Applicants appreciate the opportunity granted to conduct a telephonic interview on July 14, 2006. As reflected in the Interview Summary generated by the Examiner, Applicants explained what are believed to be significant distinctions between the position sensing technique set forth in the present claims and that described in the prior art. In view of the Examiner's explanation of the basis for rejecting the claims based on an asserted combination of Patel (U.S. Patent 6,163,127) and Rozman (U.S. Patent 5,493,200), Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 14 herein in a manner believed to be consistent with the Examiner's suggestions for distinguishing over this prior art.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-4, 9-10 13-17, 22-23, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Patel (U.S. Patent 6,163,127) in view of Rozman (U.S. Patent 5,493,200). Claims 5 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Patel in view of Rozman and further in view of Caroboiante (EP 0 558 261). Claims 6-7 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Patel in view of Rozman and further in view of Quirion (US Publication No. 2005/0151502). Claims 8, 11-12, 21, and 24-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Patel in view of Rozman and further in view of Jansen (U.S. Patent 5,585,709). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Initially, Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to the patentability arguments presented in the After Final Reply dated May 3, 2006, which are incorporated herein by reference for sake of conciseness. Furthermore, Applicants have amended the independent

claims in a manner that is believed to be fully consistent with the Examiner's suggestions for distinguishing over the applied prior art.

In view of these amendments and the previously-asserted arguments, Applicants again respectfully request that the prior art rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 28, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

D. Richard Anderson

Registration No.: 40,439

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant